Bayesian Methods for Cosmological Parameter Estimation from Cosmic Microwave Background Measurements

Nelson Christensen[1] and Renate Meyer[2*]
[1] *Physics and Astronomy, Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota, 55057, USA* [2] *Department of Statistics, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand*
(February 1, 2008)

arXiv:astro-ph/0006401v1 28 Jun 2000

We present a strategy for a statistically rigorous Bayesian approach to the problem of determining cosmological parameters from the results of observations of anisotropies in the cosmic microwave radiation background. We propose the application of Markov chain Monte Carlo methods, specifically the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm, to estimate the parameters. A complete statistical analysis is presented, with the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm described in detail.

02.70.Lq, 02.60.Pn, 98.70.Vc, 98.80.Es

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent observations of the angular power spectrum of the anisotropy of the cosmic microwave background (CMB) [1–9] have created much excitement. This data may be used to estimate cosmological parameters. The maximum in the angular power spectrum around the multipole value $l \approx 200$ is consistent with inflation and a flat universe [1,10]. However the apparent absence of a peak at $l \approx 400 - 500$ [1] may imply that we have underestimated the size of such cosmological parameters as the amount of normal baryonic matter or cold dark matter. This data, coupled with recent supernovae observations [11], seems to be leading us to seriously consider the existence of a cosmological constant. Future observations will provide valuable cosmological information [12,13].

The extraction of cosmological parameters from the CMB anisotropy data is a complicated and computer intensive activity. This is especially true as the number of cosmological parameters increases as the modal complexities grow. Current analysis exercises have included up to ten parameters; the scaler quadrupole and gravity wave perturbation normalizations (A_s and A_t), the scaler and tensor power-law indices for primordial perturbations (n_s and n_t), the reionization optical depth τ, the spatial curvature Ω_k, the energy densities for baryonic matter (Ω_b), cold dark matter (Ω_{cdm}), neutrinos (Ω_ν) and the vacuum (Ω_Λ) [14]. Other logical cosmological parameters could include the Hubble constant, number of neutrino families and their masses, etc.

Parameter estimation can be comprehensively described within the language of Bayesian statistics. Application of Bayes' theorem is well suited to astrophysical observations [15]. In Bayesian data analysis the model consists of a joint distribution over all unobserved (parameters) and observed (data) quantities. One conditions on the data to obtain the posterior distribution of the parameters. The starting point of the Bayesian approach to statistical inference is setting up a full probability model that consists of the *joint* probability distribution of all observables, denoted by $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_n)$ and unobservable quantities, denoted by $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_d)$. Using the notion of conditional probability, this joint PDF $f(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ can be decomposed into the product of the PDF of all unobservables, $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, referred to as the *prior* PDF of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, and the conditional PDF of the observables given the unobservables, $f(\mathbf{z}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$, referred to as the sampling distribution or *likelihood*, i.e.

$$f(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f(\mathbf{z}|\boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

The prior PDF contains all the information about the unobservables that is known from substantive knowledge and expert opinion *before* observing the data. All the information about the $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ that stems from the experiment is contained in the likelihood. In the light of the data, the Bayesian paradigm then updates the prior knowledge about $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, to the *posterior* PDF of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{z})$. This is done via an application of Bayes theorem through conditioning on the observations

$$f(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{z}) = \frac{f(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}{m(\mathbf{z})} \propto f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f(\mathbf{z}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$$

where $m(\mathbf{z}) = \int f(\mathbf{z}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is the marginal PDF of $\mathbf{z}$ which can be regarded as a normalizing constant as it is independent of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. The Bayesian approach is based on the likelihood function but treats the parameters as random variables and assumes a joint prior distribution that summarizes the available information about the parameters before observing the data. In the light of the observations, the information about the unknown parameters is then updated via Bayes theorem to the posterior distribution which is proportional to the product of likelihood and prior density [16].

The problem of marginalization of parameters has been the Achilles heel of Bayesian approaches to parameter estimation. The inevitable difficulty in calculating the multidimensional integrals necessary for the determination of posterior probability distributions has hindered efforts. However, these impediments have been overcome by the progress made within the last decade in Bayesian computational technology via Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods [17]. Since its initial application in

digital signal analysis [18] MCMC methods have revolutionized many areas of applied statistics and should have an impact for cosmological parameter estimation from CMB measurements.

In this paper we do NOT implement a MCMC method for estimating cosmological parameters. This task is best left to the active scientists in the field. Instead we describe how researchers may adapt their existing specialized software in order to produce probability distributions functions for the parameters that have been derived in a statistically rigorous manner.

In section II we review methods that have been used to estimate cosmological parameters from CMB measurements, plus techniques for calculating likelihoods. In section III we describe the Bayesian approach to statistical inference and its implementation via Markov chain Monte Carlo methods. In section IV we describe a methods for applying MCMC methods to cosmological parameter estimation with CMB data. Section V presents our conclusions.

II. CURRENT STATISTICAL METHODS WITH CMB DATA

A. Parameter Estimation

Various statistical approaches have attempted to estimate cosmological parameters from the CMB data. The maximum likelihood is an example [19–21]. Likelihood techniques aim at finding the values of the parameters that maximize the likelihood function. However, the maximum of the likelihood is not necessarily the peak value of the parameter's marginal distribution (its PDF) or its mean. The maximum likelihood parameter estimates will differ from the Bayes estimators. The maximum likelihood is not always good for parameter estimation; for a given parameter, the maximization depends on whether or not other parameters have been integrated out. A proper application of Bayes' theorem is attempted in some studies through the inclusion of prior distributions [1,14,20,22]. The typical approach is to select a range for the parameters and limit the maximum likelihood technique to that region in parameter space. Sophisticated *frequentist* techniques are implemented in order to maximize the likelihood, such as the *Levenberg-Marquardt method* [23,24], or the *downhill simplex method* [20,24].

In the methods described above the problem of maginalizing over parameters is non-trivial. Typically the approach is to marginalize over all parameters except the vacuum energy density (Ω_Λ) and the matter energy density ($\Omega_m = \Omega_b + \Omega_{cdm}$). This procedure gets prohibitively difficult as the number of parameters increases; in some cases the amount of computation can be expected to rise exponentially with parameter number. Hence, the techniques that have already been used will be difficult to apply to cosmological models with increasing complexity. Marginalizing over parameters will also become difficult if one no longer assumes that the variables are log-normally distributed, or if the cosmological CMB anisotropy signal is actually non-Gaussian [25,26].

Numerical maximization techniques used in maximum likelihood estimation, such as the Levenberg-Marquardt method, are only guaranteed to find a local maximum. Once they reached a local maximum they might get stuck in their search and not reach the global maximum. For this reason statisticians have applied *simulating annealing*, which is a technique for global optimization. Simulated annealing has been attempted for cosmological parameter estimation [27,28]. Simulated annealing is related to MCMC as its core component is the Metropolis Hastings algorithm. In this method the parameter space is searched in a random way. A new parameter space point is reached with a probability that depends on the likelihood and an *effective temperature* term. In the limit where the temperature approaches zero the *thermodynamics* of this parameter space search finds the system approaching the maximum of the likelihood. Stochastic methods such as these substitute deterministic integration by a statistical estimation problem. Although these methods are applicable to high-dimensional problems, they can be very inefficient in certain situations. The shortcomings of simulating annealing are that there is no guarantee that it will actually find the global maximum in finite time. The efficiency depends very much on specifying a good cooling schedule which involves the arbitrary and skillful choice of various cooling parameters that specify the algorithm and determine its performance.

B. Calculating the Likelihood

Implicit in the problem of parameter estimation is the calculation of the likelihood, namely the probability of obtaining the data given a particular model (and its associated parameters). The sizes of the data sets from CMB experiments are immense, so it is impractical to use all the raw data for producing the likelihood. Instead, radical compression of the data is imperative [23]. Even so, a precise derivation of the likelihood is very difficult [14,23,29,30]. Approximate techniques have been developed that take as input the confidence intervals of the experimental results [23,29–32]. Software for calculating the likelihoods, RADPACK is freely available at *http://flight.uchicago.edu/knox/radpack.html* [32].

In order to calculate the likelihood it is necessary to have the angular power spectrum of this CMB anisotropy for a specific model (with its associated cosmological parameters). This calculational task is accomplished by code such as CMBfast [33] or CAMB [34]. This code accepts the cosmological parameters as input, and returns the angular power spectrum of the CMB anisotropies, C_l.

These software packages serve as the work-horses of current CMB statistical work. For example, the likelihood has been calculated 30,311,820 times in order to cover a region in a ten-dimensional cosmological parameter space [14]. In other studies the likelihood was evaluated as needed within the calculation [21,20].

With a large number of parameters it becomes impractical to marginalize by integration. So when attempts are made to produce constraints in the $\Omega_\Lambda - \Omega_m$ plane approximate marginalization techniques must be applied. One can estimate the parameters by accepting the values from the maximum likelihood on the parameter grid [35,36], and then interpolate between grid points with a *cubic spline* [14]. Another technique is to maximize the likelihood with respect to all remaining parameters for a fixed point in the $\Omega_\Lambda - \Omega_m$ plane [21,20]. These methods are further complicated due to degeneracies among the cosmological parameters. [37]

III. BAYESIAN POSTERIOR COMPUTATION VIA MCMC

The difficulty with the Bayesian approach to parameter estimation is high-dimensional integration. To calculate the normalizing constant of the joint posterior PDF, for instance, requires d-dimensional integration. Having obtained the joint posterior PDF of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, the posterior PDF of a single parameter θ_i of interest can be obtained by integrating out all the other components, i.e.

$$f(\theta_i|\mathbf{z}) = \int \dots \int f(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{z}) d\theta_1 \dots d\theta_{i-1} d\theta_{i+1} \dots d\theta_d.$$

Calculation of the posterior mean of θ_i necessitates a further integration, e.g. $E[\theta_i|\mathbf{z}] = \int \theta_i f(\theta_i|\mathbf{z}) d\theta_i$.

As the joint posterior is too complex to sample from directly, we propose to use a MCMC method [17,38]. Instead of generating a sequence of independent samples from the joint posterior, in MCMC a Markov chain is constructed, whose equilibrium distribution is just the joint posterior. Thus, after running the Markov chain for a certain "burn-in" period, one obtains (correlated) samples from the limiting distribution, provided that the Markov chain has reached convergence.

One method for generating a Markov chain is via the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. The MH algorithm was developed by Metropolis et al. [39] and generalized by Hastings [40]. It is a MCMC method which means that it generates a Markov chain whose equilibrium distribution is just the target density, here the joint posterior PDF $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{z})$. For ease of notation, let us assume that the target density is some $f(x)$, where x can be d-dimensional. Then a Markov chain is specified by constructing a transition kernel $P(x, A)$, giving the conditional probability to move from state x to a point in $A \in \mathcal{B}$, the Borel σ-field on $\mathbb{R}^d$. As the probability to stay in the current state x, $P(x, \{x\})$, is not necessarily 0, we assume that the transition kernel can be expressed as

$$P(x, dy) = p(x, y)dy + r(x)\delta_x(dy)$$

where $p(x, x) = 0$ and $\delta_x(dy) = 1$ if $x \in dy$, 0 otherwise, and $r(x) = 1 - \int p(x, y)dy$. It is well known that if $p(x, y)$ satisfies '*reversibility*' or '*detailed balance*', i.e.

$$f(x)p(x, y) = f(y)p(y, x)$$

then $f(x)$ is the invariant density of the Markov chain. Together with *irreducibility* and *aperiodicity*, this gives a sufficient condition for the convergence of the Markov chain to its stationary distribution, see Tierney [41] for further details.

The MH algorithm shares the concept of a generating density with the well-known simulation technique of *rejection sampling*. However, the *candidate generating density* $q(y|x)$, $\int q(y|x)dy = 1$, can now depend on the current state x of the sampling process, and instead of rigorously accepting or rejecting a new candidate y, it is accepted with a certain *acceptance probability* $\alpha(y|x)$ also depending on the current state x, and chosen such that the transition probability $p(x, y) = q(y|x)\alpha(y|x)$ satisfies detailed balance. This is met by setting

$$\alpha(y|x)) = \min\left\{\frac{f(y)q(x|y)}{f(x)q(y|x)}, 1\right\}$$

if $f(x)q(y|x)) > 0$ and $\alpha(y|x) = 1$ otherwise. Note that irreducibility is guaranteed if $q(y|x)$ is positive on the support of f.

The steps of the MH algorithm are therefore:

Step 0: Start with an arbitrary value x_0

Step $i+1$: Generate y from $q(.|x_i)$ and u from $U(0, 1)$
If $u \leq \alpha(y|x_i)$ set $x_{i+1} = y$ (acceptance)
If $u > \alpha(y|x_i)$ set $x_{i+1} = x_i$ (rejection)

The MH algorithm does not require the normalization constant of the target density. The outcomes from the MH algorithm can be regarded as a sample from the invariant density only after a certain 'burn-in' period. For issues concerning convergence diagnostics, the reader is referred to Cowles and Carlin [42]. Note that an important special case of the MH algorithm is the '*independence chain*' where $q(y|x) = q(y)$, i.e. a new candidate is generated independently of the current state x.

Various methods to assess convergence, i.e. methods used for establishing whether an MCMC algorithm has converged and whether its output can be regarded as samples from the target distribution of the Markov chain, have been developed and implemented in CODA [43]. CODA is a menu-driven collection of SPLUS functions for analyzing the output of the Markov chain. Besides trace plots and the usual tests for convergence, CODA calculates statistical summaries of the posterior distributions and kernel density estimates.

MCMC techniques have been applied in numerous areas, from science to economics. Applications of state-space modeling in finance, e.g. stochastic volatility models applied to time series of daily exchange rates or returns of stock exchange indices, easily have 1000-5000 parameters and the Gibbs sampler shows slow convergence due to high posterior correlations [44–46]. Specially tailored MCMC algorithms, like multi-move Gibbs samplers or Metropolis-Hastings algorithms, can markedly improve the speed of convergence [47].

IV. APPLYING MCMC METHODS TO CMB ANISOTROPY DATA

It is possible for researchers to generate probability density functions for cosmological parameters from the CMB anisotropy data. This can be done in a Bayesian fashion with the MCMC serving as a means of conducting a proper marginalization over parameters. The implementation of the MCMC method would be relatively straight forward. Instead of calculating the likelihood at uniform locations in the parameter space [14], one would let the MCMC do its intelligent walk through the space. Uniform *a priori* distributions for the parameters seems reasonable, so the MCMC would sample the parameter space defined by them. Since the likelihood function can not be written explicitly in terms of the cosmological parameters, but instead in terms of the CMB anisotropy power spectra terms C_l, it will be necessary to implement a Metropolis-Hastings MCMC routine.

The Markov chain would commence at a randomly selected position in parameter space $(\theta_1^{(0)}, \ldots, \theta_d^{(0)})$. With the parameter set one would then utilize CMBfast [33] or CAMB [34] to generate a set of CMB anisotropy angular power spectrum components (C_l),.and a likelihood would then be calculated with CMB anisotropy data [23,29,31,32]. New values for the parameters $(\theta_1^{(1)}, \ldots, \theta_d^{(1)})$ would be selected via sampling from the a priori distributions. However, these values would not necessarily be *accepted* as new values. First they would be used as input to CMBfast [33] or CAMB [34] to generate a set of CMB anisotropy angular power spectrum components (C_l), and a likelihood would then be calculated with CMB anisotropy data [23,29,31,32]. The new values would be *accepted* or rejected according the to following test; a random number, u, would be generated between 0 and 1. If $u \leq \min\left[1, f(\mathbf{z}|\theta_1^{(1)}, \ldots, \theta_d^{(1)})/f(\mathbf{z}|\theta_1^{(0)}, \ldots, \theta_d^{(0)})\right]$ (where $f(\mathbf{z}|\theta_1^{(1)}, \ldots, \theta_d^{(1)})$ is the likelihood in terms of data $\mathbf{z}$ and cosmological parameters $(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_d)$) then the new parameters is *accepted* into the chain, if not the next chain element has values equal to that of the previous state. A new set of parameters would then be randomly sampled from the a priori distributions and the procedure would continue.

The generated chain of parameter values would form the set from which the statistical properties would be derived. After running the Markov chain for a certain "burn-in" period (in order for the Markov chain to reach convergence) one obtains (correlated) samples from the limiting distribution. This process would continue for a sufficiently long time (as determined by convergence diagnostics [43]).

After the *burn-in* the frequency of appearance of parameters would represent the actual posterior density of the parameter. From the posterior density one can then create confidence intervals. Summary statistics are produced from the distribution, such as posterior mean and standard deviation. A cross-correlation matrix is also easily produced; this would be of great importance for quantifying the "degeneracy" of Ω_m and Ω_m [37]. A distinct advantage of the MCMC approach is that computational time scales linearly with parameter number. Hence, the MCMC approach to cosmological parameter estimation may provide the best strategy when testing complex models with numerous parameters. Also, MCMC methods could work with the exact form of the likelihood, although the approximate forms may prove to be sufficiently adequate [23,29,31,32].

The above method would constitute the simplest implementation of the Metropolis-Hastings method, that of an independence chain. We have just used an *acceptance probability* $\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*|\boldsymbol{\theta})$, defined by

$$\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \min\left\{\frac{f(\mathbf{z}|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)q(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)}{f(\mathbf{z}|\boldsymbol{\theta})q(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*|\boldsymbol{\theta})}, 1\right\}$$

where the generating density $q(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is the uniform density over the parameter space and thus, in particular, independent of the current state. By using uniform priors, the posterior PDFs in the acceptance probability calculation reduce to the likelihoods. However, the efficiency of a Metropolis-Hastings algorithm depends crucially on the form of the generating density $q(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*|\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Just using a uniform distribution that does not even depend on the current state θ is the most simple but probably most inefficient way to accomplish the task. Even with a uniform distribution, the algorithm will be irreducible/aperiodic/reversible and thus the Markov chain will converge towards its stationary distribution.

A slightly better way might be to use a uniform distribution in a neighborhood of the current $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Any prior information could be useful, such as correlations that one could use to specify a multivariate normal centered around the current $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ with a covariance matrix that takes said correlations into account. The optimization of the Metropolis-Hastings MCMC strategy will inevitably require experimentation with the generating density $q(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*|\boldsymbol{\theta})$. While this may require some detailed study, the benefit will be the ability to generate posterior distributions for a large number of cosmological parameters.

V. DISCUSSION

A proper Bayesian approach to parameter estimation allows one to simultaneously estimate both dynamic signals and measurement noise. MCMC methods have demonstrated their importance in Bayesian parameter estimation problems with large numbers of parameters. As cosmological models grow in complexity it will become necessary to use techniques such as those discussed here in order to handle marginalization of parameters. Furthermore, a MCMC approach is not restricted to the assumption of Gaussian noise. A heavy-tailed observation error distribution such as a Student-t-distribution with large degrees of freedom might be more appropriate to allow for crude measurement errors and ensure that resulting estimates will be robust against additive outliers. Non-Gaussian error distributions are readily incorporated into MCMC calculations. We therefore strongly advocate the Bayesian approach via Metropolis-Hastings sampling in future analyses of cosmological parameter estimation from CMB data.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Royal Society of New Zealand Marsden Fund, the University of Auckland Research Committee, and Carleton College.

---

* Authors' email addresses: nchriste@carleton.edu, meyer@stat.auckland.ac.nz

[1] P. de Bernardis, P. A. R. Ade, J. J. Bock, J. R. Bond, J. Borrill, A. Boscaleri, K. Coble, B. P. Crill, G. De Gasperis, P. C. Farese, P. G. Ferreira, K. Ganga, M. Giacometti, E. Hivon, V. V. Hristov, A. Iacoangeli, A. H. Jaffe, A. E. Lange, L. Martinis, S. Masi, P. V. Mason, P. D. Mauskopf, A. Melchiorri, L. Miglio, T. Montroy, C. B. Netterfield, E. Pascale, F. Piacentini, D. Pogosyan, S. Prunet, S. Rao, G. Romeo, J. E. Ruhl, F. Scaramuzzi, D. Sforna, N. Vittorio, Nature **404**, 955 - 959 (2000).

[2] M. J. Devlin, A. de Oliveira-Costa, T. Herbig, A. D. Miller, C. B. Netterfield, L. A. Page, M. Tegmark. Astrophys. J. Lett. **509**, L69 (1998).

[3] T. Herbig, A. de Oliveira-Costa, M. J. Devlin, A. D. Miller, L. A. Page, M. Tegmark, Astrophys. J. Lett. **509**, L73 (1998).

[4] A. de Oliveira-Costa, M. J. Devlin, T. Herbig, A. D. Miller, C. B. Netterfield, L. A. Page, M. Tegmark, Astrophys. J. Lett. **509**, L77 (1998).

[5] G.W. Wilson, L. Knox, S. Dodelson, K. Coble, E.S. Cheng, D.A. Cottingham, D.J. Fixsen, A.B. Goldin, C.A. Inman, M.S. Kowitt, S.S. Meyer, L.A. Page, J.L. Puchalla, J.E. Ruhl, R.F. Silverberg, astro-ph/9902047, 1999.

[6] E. Torbet, M. J. Devlin, W. B. Dorwart, T. Herbig, A. D. Miller, M. R. Nolta, L. Page, J. Puchalla, H. T. Tran, Astrophys. J. Lett. **521**, L79 (1999).

[7] A. D. Miller, R. Caldwell, M. J. Devlin, W. B. Dorwart, T. Herbig, M. R. Nolta, L. A. Page, J. Puchalla, E. Torbet, and H. T. Tran, Astrophys. J. Lett. **524**, L1 (1999).

[8] Kimberly Ann Coble, astro-ph/9911419, 1999.

[9] J. B. Peterson, G. S. Griffin, M. G. Newcomb, D. L. Alvarez, C. M. Cantalupo, D. Morgan, K. W. Miller, K.Ganga, D. Pernic, M. Thoma, astro-ph/9910503, 1999.

[10] L. Knox and L. Page, astro-ph/0002162, 2000.

[11] S. Perlmutter, G. Aldering, G. Goldhaber, R. A. Knop, P. Nugent, P. G. Castro, S. Deustua, S. Fabbro, A. Goobar, D. E. Groom, I. M. Hook, A. G. Kim, M. Y. Kim, J. C. Lee, N. J. Nunes, R. Pain, C. R. Pennypacker, R. Quimby, C. Lidman, R. S. Ellis, M. Irwin, R. G. McMahon, P. Ruiz-Lapuente, N. Walton, B. Schaefer, B. J. Boyle, A. V. Filippenko, T. Matheson, A. S. Fruchter, N. Panagia, H. J. M. Newberg, W. J. Couch, Astrophys. J. **517**, 565 (1999).

[12] http://map.gsfc.nasa.gov/

[13] http://astro.estec.esa.nl/Planck/

[14] M. Tegmark and M. Zaldarriaga, astro-ph0002091, 2000.

[15] P. C. Gregory and T. J. Loredo, Astrophys. J. **398**, 146 (1992).

[16] B.P. Carlin and T.A. Louis, *Bayes and Emperical Bayes Methods for Data Analysis*, (Chapman and Hall, London, 1996).

[17] W. R. Gilks, S. Richardson, and D.J. Spiegelhalter, *Markov Chain Monte Carlo in Practice*, (Chapman and Hall, London, 1996).

[18] S. Geman amd D. Geman, IEEE Trans. Patter. Anal Mach. Intell. **6**, 721 (1984).

[19] A. Balbit, P. Ade, J. Bock, J. Borrill, A. Boscaleri, P. de Bernardis, P. G. Ferreira, S. Hanany, V. Hristov, A. H. Jaffe, A. T. Lee, S. Oh, E. Pascale, B. Rabii, P. L. Richards, G. F. Smoot, R. Stompor, C. D. Winant, J. H. P. Wu, astro-ph/0005124

[20] A. Melchiorri, P. A. R. Ade, P. de Bernardis, J. J. Bock, J. Borrill, A. Boscaleri, B. P. Crill, G. de Troia, P. Farese, P. G. Ferreira, K. Ganga, G. de Gasperis, M. Giacometti, V. V. Hristov, A. H. Jaffe, A. E. Lange, S. Masi, P. D. Mauskopf, L. MIglio, C. B. Netterfield, E. Pascale, F. Piacentini, G. Romeo, J. E. Ruhl, N. Vittorio, astro-ph/9911445

[21] S. Dodelson, L. Knox, astro-ph/9909454, 1999.

[22] A.E. Lange, P.A.R. Ade, J.J. Bock, J.R. Bond, J. Borrill, A. Boscaleri, K. Coble, B.P. Crill, P. de Bernardis, P. Farese, P. Ferreira, K. Ganga, M. Giacometti, E. Hivon, V.V. Hristov, A. Iacoangeli, A.H. Jaffe, L. Martinis, S. Masi, P.D. Mauskopf, A. Melchiorri, T. Montroy, C.B. Netterfield, E. Pascale, F. Piacentini, D. Pogosyan, S. Prunet, S. Rao, G. Romeo, J.E. Ruhl, F. Scaramuzzi, D. Sforna, astro-ph/0005004, 2000.

[23] J. R. Bond, A. H. Jaffe, L. Knox, Phys. Rev. D. **57**, 2117 (1998).

[24] W. H. Press, B. Flannery, S. A. Teukolsky and W. T. Vetterling, *Numerical Recipes in Fortran*, 2nd ed. (Cam-

bridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1992).
[25] P. G. Ferreira, J. Magueijo, K. M. Górski, Astrophys. J. Lett. **503**, L1 (1998).
[26] M. Zaldarriaga, Phys. Rev. D., *in press* (2000).
[27] S. Hannestad, Phys. Rev D. **61**, 023002 (1999).
[28] L. Knox, Phys. Rev D **52**, 4307 (1995).
[29] J. G. Bartlett, M. Douspis, A. Blanchard, M. Le Dour, astro-ph/9903045, 1999.
[30] J. R. Bond, A. H. Jaffe, L. Knox, Astrophys. J. **533**, 19 (1998).
[31] M. Douspis, J.G. Bartlett, A. Blanchard, M. Le Dour, astro-ph 0004283, 2000.
[32] J. Borrill, astro-ph/9911389, 1999.
[33] U. Seljak, M. Zaldarriaga, Astrophys. J. **469**, 437 (1996).
[34] A. Lewis, A. Challinor, A. Lasenby, Astrophys. J. *in press*, 2000.
[35] C. H. Lineweaver, Astrophys. J. Lett. **505**, L69 (1998).
[36] M. Tegmark, Astrophys. J. Lett. **514**, L69 (1999).
[37] G. Efstathiou, J. R. Bond, M.N.R.A.S. **304**, 75 (1999).
[38] N.L. Christensen and R. Meyer, Phys. Rev. D, **58**, 082001 (1998).
[39] N. Metropolis, A.W. Rosenbluth, M.N. Rosenbluth, A.H. Teller, and E. Teller, J. Chem. Phys. **21**, 1087 (1953).
[40] W. K. Hastings, Biometrika, **57**, 97 (1970).
[41] L. Tierney, Ann. Stat. **22**, 1701 (1994).
[42] M. K. Cowles, B. P. Carlin, J. Am. Stat. Assoc. **91**, 883 (1996).
[43] N. G. Best, M. K. Cowles and S. K. Vines, *CODA manual version 0.30*, (Cambridge, UK: MRC Biostatistics Unit, 1995).
[44] R. Meyer, in *Data Analysis, Classification, and Applications*, edited by W. Gaul, O. Opitz, M. Schader, (Springer, Berlin , 2000), to appear.
[45] E. Jacquier, N.G. Polson, P.E. Rossi, J. Bus. Econ. Stat. **12**, 371 (1994).
[46] R. Meyer and J. Yu, Routine and Robust Bayesian Analysis of Stochastic Volatility Models, submitted to *Econometrics J.* (2000).
[47] S. Kim, N. Shephard, S. Chib, Rev. Econ. Studies **65**, 361 (1998).